

forth in a protracted conflict between Israel and Palestine. There is never justification for attacks on innocent civilians, and we must demand that the anti-Israel sentiment that pervades Palestine be addressed.

The Israelis remain committed to the peace process, and Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu has done his part in making concessions that pave the way for substantive talks. This has been met by a refusal by the Palestinians to even recognize Israel's right to exist.

Every sovereign nation has a duty and right to defend its citizens. As a result, the United States must continue to support Israel's right to self-defense. Congress must ensure that the administration does not call on Israel to make concessions that endanger its security without demanding similar changes from the Palestinians. Congress must make clear its support for Israel's right to defend its citizens and demand the United Nations enforce a ban on Iranian exports of sophisticated weapons to Hamas and other terrorist groups.

SIDNEY HARMAN

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 15, 2011

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this week, Sidney Harman—a good friend to me and to so many—died at the age of 92. Sidney was the husband of my friend, Congresswoman Jane Harman; he lived a full, rich life, and he will be deeply missed. Sidney was a pioneering entrepreneur in the field of hi-fi stereo systems—but after his business success, he went on to make outstanding contributions to our country's civic life for decades. He was a strong advocate of civil rights who pitched in as a public school teacher; he was Under Secretary of Commerce under President Carter; he was a dynamic philanthropist who made his mark as a patron of education, the arts, and journalism. His many accomplishments, and the admiration of so many who knew him, are certain to long outlive him. But in the wake of his loss, my sincere condolences are with his wife, Congresswoman Harman, his children; and all those who mourn his passing.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON
THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR
2012

SPEECH OF

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 14, 2011

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. Con. Res. 34) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2012 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2013 through 2021:

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chair, as we debate the House budget resolution today, I ask my colleagues: are you here to make a point, or are you here to make a difference?

We have reached a tipping point in our country's financial future. Our nation is pushed

to the edge of a fiscal cliff. We are over \$14 trillion in debt. CBO projects that the President's budget request will cause net interest payments to skyrocket over the next 10 years—from \$260 billion in 2012 to \$931 billion in 2021. If we continue on our current path, Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and interest payments to service the debt will consume all government revenues within 14 years. We're borrowing 41 cents on every dollar. And we're borrowing from nations such as China and Saudi Arabia that do not share our values or national priorities. Moody's has warned that our coveted AAA bond rating could be at risk in as little as a year. We've seen what a downgrade can do to foreign economies, and we must not let that happen here.

Seeing the signs about our nation's financial future, I introduced legislation almost five years ago—during the last Republican House majority—to create an independent bipartisan commission to address unsustainable federal spending, putting everything on the table for discussion—entitlements, all other spending programs and tax policy—and like the Department of Defense's Base Realignment and Closure Commission process, Congress would be required to vote up or down on the commission's recommendations. An iteration of this legislation became the blueprint for President's National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform, or the Bowles-Simpson Commission.

The President appointed the Bowles-Simpson Commission. He established their working parameters in a manner that, quite frankly, I believed was designed to doom it to failure. Despite this, the report released last December by the commission was supported by a bipartisan majority of the commission's 18 members. It makes clear that addressing the debt and the deficit isn't just a simple exercise in rooting out waste, fraud and abuse, eliminating earmarks, and reining in discretionary spending. Those, to be sure, are important reforms, but alone don't come close to solving the debt and the deficit crisis. Reform must begin with entitlements and other mandatory spending and must also include all other sacred cows, including tax reform and defense spending.

Until two days ago, the President barely acknowledged the work of his commission. He didn't help them assemble the necessary 14 votes to send their recommendations to Congress. Then, he walked away from his commission's recommendations, first by not expressing any views on their report, then silence during the State of the Union, and again silence in his FY 2012 budget request. On Wednesday, the President finally started to recognize the seriousness of this problem. His leadership is needed. But I was disappointed that he failed to offer specific solutions, and seemed more interested in staking out political positions than finding common ground. I hope his call for negotiations across the aisle to develop a legislative framework are successful, but this seems like yet another instance where the President is sidestepping the recommendations of his own fiscal commission.

I believe that the Bowles-Simpson proposal offers the way forward for the most comprehensive and realistic solution to our nation's fiscal problems. I have repeatedly said that, while there are some changes I would make in the plan, if a version of the Bowles-

Simpson plan were given a vote on the House floor, I would vote for it. But we don't have that choice in the House.

My friend JIM COOPER, whom I have partnered with over the past four years to offer a bipartisan way forward to address the nation's financial crisis, initially planned to offer the principals of the Bowles-Simpson proposal as a substitute amendment to be considered today. Recognizing that the President's recent speech has inflamed partisan passions, he withdrew the amendment so as not to undercut efforts underway in the Senate by the so-called Gang of Six. Had the Cooper substitute been offered, I would have voted for it, even though I did not agree with every part of it, such as the reconciliation instructions Mr. COOPER had for the committee of jurisdiction over the federal workforce. I would have voted yes to indicate my continued support for the principals of the Bowles-Simpson commission. Mr. COOPER has engaged in the kind of bipartisan cooperation that we must have, the kind of forthright, realistic conversation about our nation's fiscal future in which we must engage across the aisle, across the Capitol and down Pennsylvania Avenue if we are to have any hope of coming up with a credible plan to protect the future of our children and grandchildren.

I see the Ryan proposal as an honest attempt to provide a blueprint to continue the conversation on our country's financial future and move forward so that a conference with the Senate can produce a budget plan that ensures our national security and protects the programs on which so many Americans rely. The Ryan bill may not pass the Senate, but I commend the chairman of the House Budget Committee for his courage in putting forth a bold proposal to address our nation's skyrocketing and unfunded financial obligations. While his focus is not the "everything on the table" approach I prefer, I believe Mr. RYAN could provide an opening to force both chambers and the President to deal with entitlement spending that is consuming the federal budget. He deserves credit for taking on an issue so many in Congress would rather continue to kick down the road.

It's easy to stand in the well of the House and criticize any legislation. As I look at Chairman RYAN's measure, I don't agree with every provision. I believe there are some critical issues that are missing and things that must be changed, and there are several things that I do not support and will not support if authorizing legislation is offered to implement his budget blueprint.

As I have stated, I believe everything must be on the table for discussion, starting with all entitlement spending, discretionary program spending, and tax policy. But we have reached the moment of truth for the kind of country we will leave to our children and grandchildren. Therefore, I will vote for the Ryan budget so that we can continue to move this process forward and continue the discussion.

This proposal would put our nation on course to reduce all of the publicly held debt by 2060, a feat not reached since Andrew Jackson's presidency. Relative to the President's proposal, it cuts \$6.2 trillion. Under this plan, within four years, we would reach primary balance on our debt, which the President's proposal never attains.

Reaching primary balance, which is when revenue is greater than spending less interest